

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to update the references to related applications and to correct a citation to a prior art patent. No new matter has been entered.

Claims 1, 3, 24, 26, and 28 have been amended. Claims 1, 24, and 26 have been amended to further clarify that the invention relates to communications amongst respective client devices, while claim 3 has been amended to remove extraneous language in the preamble and claim 28 has been amended to make a typographical correction. No new matter has been entered.

In the Official Action, the Examiner indicated that the Information Disclosure Statements submitted in June, 2001 and January, 2002 were not considered for failing to include copies of all of the cited references. Applicant notes that the majority of the cited references were available in the parent applications from which the present application claims priority, and thus were not submitted. In any case, a new Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is attached hereto including copies of each of the cited references. Consideration of the cited references is requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-35 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-53 of commonly owned U.S. Patent No. 5,987,103. While Applicant disagrees that the claims of the present application are unpatentable over claims 1-53 of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,103, in view of the common ownership and claim of priority under 35 U.S.C. §120, Applicant has prepared the attached Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-35 is requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner further rejected claims 1 and 24-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Hitchcock (USP 5,157,717). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to a server computer (claims 1-23), methods (claims 24-33), and a system (claims 34-35) for enabling client devices to securely communicate with each other. The server computer receives data from the client devices in the format of a form and transmits portions of the data to other client devices for further processing (claim 1). The

server pushes the data received from the source client devices to respective destination client devices (claim 24) that optionally may be designated by the user of a source client device (claim 26). The server further includes a locator object for identifying and locating users and client devices within a system of client devices and databases (claim 34). The teachings of Hitchcock are believed to be irrelevant to such a system.

Hitchcock discloses a portable automated teller machine that allows a user to conduct a banking transaction via a telephone handset. Hitchcock does not teach a system that permits multiple client devices to communicate with each other, that pushes transaction data to a client device when transaction data from another client device exists in the system, or that permits a user to identify another client device for processing a transaction. Applicant submits that Hitchcock's portable automated teller machine is instead designed to operate as a conventional automated teller machine to provide a secure transaction between two computers. Hitchcock nowhere suggests that a plurality of the described portable automated teller machines may communicate with each other via a server. Applicant submits that such distributed communications and processing are contrary to the nature of the automated teller machines described by Hitchcock. Also, Hitchcock nowhere suggests that the screen-forms presented to the display of the portable automated teller machines function as the operating system for the device. Accordingly, the invention of claims 1 and 24-30 is believed to clearly distinguish over the teachings of Hitchcock. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 24-30 over Hitchcock is requested.

Claims 2-23 and 31-35 were not rejected over the prior art. Applicant assumes that the Examiner finds these claims to be allowable over the prior art and requests a Notice to that effect.

DOCKET NO.: CFTI-0095
Application No.: 09/589,814
Office Action Dated: February 12, 2004

PATENT

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth herein, the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowability is respectfully solicited.

Date: August 10, 2004



Michael P. Dunnam
Registration No. 32,611

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439